

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance for the above-identified application are now respectfully requested. Claims 1-30 are pending for examination at the time of the Office Action dated July 15, 2003 (hereinafter referred to as “the current Office Action” or simply “the Office Action”), of which claims 1, 11, 22 and 26-30 are independent claims. The Office Action rejects each of the claims 1-30 using a variety of rejections including 35 U.S.C. 102(b) under United States patent number 5,442,633 to Perkins et al. (hereinafter referred to simply as “Perkins”), 35 U.S.C. 103(e) under United States patent number 6,215,790 to Voit et al. (hereinafter referred to simply as “Voit”) in view of Perkins, and under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over a combination of Perkins and Voit and alleged admitted prior art.

As a preliminary matter, in response to Applicants arguments presented in response to the prior Office Action dated February 12, 2003 ((hereinafter referred to simply as “the prior Office Action”), the current Office Action states that “Applicant’s arguments with respect to claims 1-30 have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection”. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 22-25 remain rejected under the same grounds (i.e., 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Perkins) in the current Office Action as they were in the prior Office Action. Therefore, Applicants arguments with respect to this rejection are not rendered moot in light of any new grounds of rejection, and Applicants arguments with respect to this rejection are reasserted by reference in this response. Similarly, as the rejections are quite similar and use the same art, many of the arguments presented in response to the prior Office Action are still relevant.

Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a specific use of “an IP address of [a] user in [a] mobile communications network system including a location address which identifies an access link termination node for which the user has carried out location registration and a user identifier which identifies the user.” An embodiment of such an IP address is illustrated in Figure 2 of the present specification by way of example. As asserted in Amendment “B” in response to the prior Office Action, neither Perkins nor Voit discloses this recited feature, especially when read in light of the claim as a whole.

With respect to Claim 1, the current Office Action rightfully acknowledges that “Voit et al are silent to mention the IP address including the location address which identifies an access

link termination node for which the user has carried out location registration and a user identifier [which] identifies the user.” However, just as in the prior Office Action, the current Office Action asserts that Perkins discloses such an IP address by referring to column 5, lines 7 -17 of Perkins et al. (see page 4, lines 3-5 of the current office action). However, as Applicants argued in response to the prior Office Action, this cited passage only discloses that an IP address of a host (BAS 12) can be partitioned into a LAN address and a host address.

In Perkins et al., as mentioned in Applicants’ responses (dated November 15, 2002, and April 11, 2003), an IP address is provided to each of an MH 10 and a BAS 12 independently and a routing is performed by using the LSR option of the internet datagram header and by rewriting the destination address of the header. In this method, the amount of information to be included in the header becomes large, and the routing process becomes complicated.

In Perkins et al., the IP address of the MH 10 does not include the location address recited in the claims. Specifically, the IP address of Perkins is not an address which identifies an access link termination node for which a user has carried out location registration. The IP address of the BAS 12 is separate from the IP address of the MH 10.

Also, Applicants admitted prior art does not include such an IP address.

Therefore, neither Voit, Perkins, nor Applicants’ admitted prior art disclose a feature of Claim 1; namely, that the IP address includes a location address as recited in addition to a user identifier.

The other independent claims

Each of the other independent claims recite a similar IP address. For example, Claims 11, 22, 26-29 recite specific uses of “an IP address of the user in the mobile communications network system including a location address which identifies an access link termination node for which the user has carried out location registration and a user identifier which identifies the user.” Claim 30 recites a “means for generating an IP address of the user including the location address of the access link termination node and a user identifier which identifies the user.”

As previously mentioned with respect to Claim 1, neither Voit, Perkins, nor Applicants’ admitted prior art disclose this feature. Accordingly, none of the independent claims is rendered unpatentable in light of Perkins, Voit or Applicants’ admitted prior art, either singly or in combination.

Additional arguments regarding independent Claims 26-30

In addition, claims 26-30 recite a feature in that in a domain-name server, an IP address of a user (including a location address of an access link termination node and an identifier of the user) is managed in connection with a domain name of the user. Neither Perkins nor Voit nor disclose this feature.

Voit does disclose a domain-name server (Voit, Figure 9). In the domain-name server, a domain name of a user and an IP address of the user are connected (or related). Meanwhile, in Perkins, each of a MH (Mobile Host) 10 and a BAS (Base Access Station) 12 has its own IP address (see column 5, lines 18-20. Column 5, lines 51-54, column 6, lines 17 -22 and column 6, lines 35-38).

Therefore, if Perkins and Voit are combined, only a domain name of a MH 10 and an IP address of the MH 10 are connected (related). Here, it is clear that the IP address of the MH 10 does not include information regarding a location address of a BAS 12 in whose area the MH10 resides.

Hence, this feature of Claims 26-30 is not described, taught or suggested by Perkins and Voit, even if combined.

This serves as an independent point also showing that Claims 26-30 are not anticipated by nor rendered obvious over Perkins and Voit, either singly or in combination.

All dependent claims

The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from one of these independent claims, and thus are patentable over Perkins, Voit, and Applicants' admitted prior art for at least the reasons provided for their corresponding independent claim.

In light of these remarks, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the pending rejections. In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 13th day of October, 2003.

Respectfully submitted,



ADRIAN J. LEE
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 42,785
Customer No.: 022913

WORKMAN NYDEGGER
1000 Eagle Gate Tower
60 East South Temple
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111
Telephone: (801) 533-9800
Fax: (801) 328-1707

AJL:ds
W:\15689\52\AJL0000000309V001.DOC